

CORRECTIONS STANDARDS AUTHORITY

600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-445-5073
www.csa.ca.gov



January 29, 2007

Dear Applicants:

The Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) is pleased to announce that the CSA Board approved the following sixteen applicants to receive the Title II Formula Grant funding:

1. City of Oakland, The Paragon Project
2. Orange County Bar Foundation
3. Behavioral Health Administration
4. City of Watsonville
5. The Harwood Memorial Park, Inc.
6. Youth Employment Partnership
7. Yolo County Office of Education
8. Santa Cruz County Probation
9. Imperial County Office of Education
10. South Bay Community Services
11. Sonoma County Probation Department
12. Boys and Girls Club of Oxnard
13. Marin County Probation Department
14. South Bay Workforce Investment Board
15. Mariposa County Probation
16. Mendocino Big Brothers Big Sisters (partial funding)

Congratulations to those of you who were successful in the RFP process. I will be contacting each of you in the very near future.

Applicants may submit an appeal regarding the evaluation process to the CSA Board. Appeals must be received by 5:00 p.m. February 5, 2007. The appeal may challenge the reliability, fairness or validity of the RFP rating process. Please understand only the process can be appealed, not a proposal's final score.

Issues related to appeals are likely addressed through knowledge and awareness of the proposal evaluation process. Prior to consideration of filing an appeal, applicants are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the rating criteria specific to the RFP, as well as the grant evaluation process.

Any applicant that wishes to appeal the grant evaluation process must:

- Meet with CSA staff to review the rating process.
- After meeting with staff, if the applicant determines there is a flaw in the process they must submit a letter to the Executive Director articulating their concern.
- The Executive Director of CSA will review the appeal and make a final ruling or present it to the CSA Board for further review.
- The CSA Board will make the final ruling of the appeal.

If you have additional questions, please contact me at (916) 341-7392 or by e-mail at connie.lucero@cdcr.ca.gov.

Respectfully Submitted,

CONNIE LUCERO
Corrections Consultant
Corrections Standards Authority

TITLE II FORMULA GRANT RATING PROCESS

Phase I consisted of the following steps:

From October 30 through November 2, 2006, a panel of 24 subject-matter experts assembled to review the proposals for adherence to the RFP, and for clarity and completeness. The Panel represented Probation, Police, Sheriff, and Community Based Organizations.

1. Consistent with the traditional rating process, all readers convened and attended training on the rating process.
2. The readers rated the proposals based on selected rating dimensions (rating criteria) approved by CSA and included in the RFP.
3. Two panelists rated each grant proposal. The scores of the two panelists were recorded. Next, the panelists attempted to reconcile any differences in order to produce the final ratings.
4. Of the 141 proposals received, the top 34 proposals rated most in compliance with the RFP (presenting the clearest, most comprehensive, narrative regarding their proposed programs) were moved forward to the second phase.

Top-rated proposals advancing to the second phase of rating were determined by the total dollar amount of proposals equal to twice the amount of funds available (\$13 million). CSA staff convened a second rating panel of subject-matter experts and current practitioners to rate the identified finalists. Four State Advisory Group (SAG) members participated as raters for the second phase. CSA staff trained the second group of raters for the final portion of the rating process on November 8 and 9, 2006. As part of the second phase of review, all of the phase II raters read and scored all of the top 34 proposals. Once rated on the ten dimensions contained in the RFP, the scores for each proposal were entered into the software program to analyze the ratings, determine the level of rater agreement, and rank proposals according to merit. The second panel of raters reconvened November 30, 2006 and discussed the ratings in order to reconcile differences identified by the software program.

Phase II consisted of the following steps:

1. The top 34 proposals identified by Phase 1 were read by a new panel of eight readers. The second rating panel consisted of subject-matter experts and current practitioners to rate the identified finalists. Four State Advisory Group (SAG) members participated as raters for the second phase.
2. CSA staff trained the second group of raters for the final portion of the rating process
3. The raters made independent ratings for the 10 rating dimensions described in the RFP. All eight raters read and rated all 34 proposals.
4. After all the ratings were submitted, they were entered into CSA's proposals evaluation software.
5. The eight-member panel was assembled to review the ratings.
6. Rater disagreements were discussed and reconciled if necessary.
7. The rating totals were compiled and the proposal rankings were presented to the panel for their approval.